

To: Robinson, Jeffrey[Robinson.Jeffrey@epa.gov]; Verhalen, Frances[verhalen.frances@epa.gov]
Cc: Mohr, Ashley[Mohr.Ashley@epa.gov]
From: Casso, Ruben[/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=E33DF0ABBBF049959E9100E556C7E634-CASSO, RUBEN]
Sent: Thur 8/5/2021 8:40:17 PM (UTC)
Subject: FW: R6 Updated Risk Population Tables
[Eastman Chemical Updated Risk Population Table.docx](#)
[Union Carbide Updated Risk Population Table.docx](#)
[Original Table A2 Eastman.docx](#)
[Original Table A5 UnionCarbide.docx](#)

Mike Moeller sent us corrected tables for Eastman & Carbide. There was a bug OAQPS did not catch in time to fix these tables before sending us the risk report. **These do NOT affect the bottom line cancer risk number.**

I've also attached copies of the 2 relevant tables that are currently in the final risk report on our website so you can see the differences.

Are these revised tables sufficient? Or do we want OAQPS to send us a revised risk report with the corrected tables?

From: Moeller, Michael <moeller.michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, August 5, 2021 3:13 PM
To: Casso, Ruben <Casso.Ruben@epa.gov>
Cc: Mohr, Ashley <Mohr.Ashley@epa.gov>
Subject: R6 Updated Risk Population Tables

Hi Ruben and Ashley,

As I discussed on the call with Eastman, we did discover a bug within a previous version of the HEM demographic calculation that affects the results for the risk population tables in the original risk report. Specifically, this affected Eastman as well as Union Carbide. The tables from these two facilities were only displaying population within 3km instead of the intended 50km as the others.

I've attached updated tables for Eastman and Union Carbide that now correctly displays the population for the full modeling domain (50km). Would you like me to also submit a revised risk assessment report? Or are these individual updated tables sufficient?

I apologize for the confusion, and let me know if there are any additional questions.

Thanks,

-Mike